

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/617,588	07/11/2003	Robert F. Mouradian	TEC03-01	3698	
61089 7590 09/25/2007			EXAMINER		
CHAPLIN IN	BARRY W. CHAPLIN, ESQ. CHAPLIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC			SINES, BRIAN J	
	ROUGH OFFICE PARK ST PARK DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	JGH, MA 01581		1743		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	:	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/617,588	0/617,588 MOURADIAN ET A			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Brian J. Sines	1743			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence	address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a sign of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 M</u>	ay 2007.				
,—	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar			he merits is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-29 and 39 is/are v	vithdrawn from considera	ation.			
'=	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
· ·	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>1-24,30-38 and 40-56</u> are subject to r	estriction and/or election	requirement			
اکا(ہ	Claim(s) 1-24,30-30 and 40-30 are subject to 1	estriction and/or election	requirement.			
Applicati	ion Papers					
<i>,</i> —	The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
111	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
/—	•	ammer. Note the attache	a Office Action of Tolling	10-102.		
•	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document		Amuliantian Na			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			al Stage		
	 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 		in received in this Nation	ai Staye		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		t received.			
		·				
Attachmen		🗆	0 (DTC :::0)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/617,588 Page 2

Art Unit: 1743

, . . . A

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-24 and 40-50, drawn to a vapor analysis apparatus, classified in class 422, subclass 83.
- II. Claims 30 38, 55 and 56, drawn to a sample probe, classified in class 422, subclass 100.
- III. Claims 51 54, drawn to a method of operating a vapor analysis apparatus,classified in class 73, subclass 23.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the vapor analysis apparatus does not requires the use of a sample probe comprising a user actuator.

Inventions I – III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced

Application/Control Number: 10/617,588 Page 3

Art Unit: 1743

with another materially different product. For example, the method of invention III as recited in claim 51 does not specifically require the use of a vapor analysis apparatus comprising the particular controller configuration or sample probe as required for the apparatus of either invention I or II.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Sines whose telephone number is (571) 272-1263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (11 AM - 8 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/617,588

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian J. Sines
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1743

Page 5